DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 518 JC 900 242

AUTHOR Kelly, Diana K.
TITLE Reviving the "Deadwood": How To Create an Institutional Climate To Encourage the Professional Growth and Revitalization of Mid-Career Faculty in the Community College.
PUB DATE 2 May 90
NOTE 55p.; Graduate Seminar Paper, Claremont College.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; *College Faculty; College Planning; *Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Faculty Workload; Scholarship; *Teacher Burnout; Teacher Morale; Teacher Persistence; Teacher Shortage; Two Year Colleges; Universities

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the lack of vitality among community college mid-career faculty, arguing that this may be an even more severe problem at two-year colleges than at four-year institutions. Emphasis is placed on the role of community colleges and the institutional changes required to revitalize mid-career faculty. The problem of faculty vitality is examined in terms of the impending faculty shortage, symptoms of faculty burnout, measures of faculty vitality, and the specific nature of the problem of faculty vitality in the community college. Institutional causes of the problem are also examined with particular attention to the campus culture, the departmental climate, the influence of colleagues, faculty workload, changes in the student population, the tenure system, and the reward structure. Finally, solutions to the problem are suggested in terms of successful practices for revitalization which have been used in business and in institutions of higher education. These practices include individualized growth plans, career planning, faculty exchanges, faculty internships, sabbaticals, job variety, faculty development programs, post-tenure evaluations, and incentives and rewards. A brief conclusion offers some specific suggestions for ways community colleges can enhance the professional growth and vitality of mid-career faculty. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318518

Reviving the "Deadwood:"

How to Create an Institutional Climate to Encourage the Professional Growth and Revitalization of Mid-career Faculty in the Community College.

Diana K. Kelly

JC 900242

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. K. Kelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Education 463
The Condition of American Higher Education
Professor Jack Schuster
May 2, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reviving the "Deadwood:"
How to Create an Institutional Climate for the Professional Growth and Revitalization of Mid-career Faculty in the Community College

Most college students have experienced the "yellowed lecture note syndrome" at some point during their college experience. This can be a very frustrating experience for students who are aware that they are not receiving accurate, timely information. Others may not discover that they had been receiving out-of-date instruction until they leave college. When they try to enter a career field they may discover that their skills and knowledge are many years behind current practices.

In addition to the frustration experienced by students, the "yellowed lecture note syndrome" should be viewed as a symptom of much more critical problem: faculty members who have lost interest in their field. Perhaps they are bored with the repetitive nature of teaching the same classes for many years. Maybe they had never been highly involved in their field. Or it is possible that their interests have shifted over the years. Whatever the reason, when faculty lose interest in their discipline, not only are students cheated, but the institution also loses a potentially vital human resource.

In the community colleges, the lack of vitality among mid-career faculty may be an even more severe problem than it is in four-year institutions. Community college faculty often gain tenure in the first few years of their teaching career. Tenure is generally granted almost automatically, with just a few evaluations of teaching and usually no evaluations of scholarly involvement. Moreover, unlike university faculty, community college faculty have no reward structure which recognizes the importance of involvement in the discipline. Ranks and salary are typically determined automatically through years of service rather than through achievements in teaching or in the discipline. Finally, the

heavy teaching load of community college faculty mitigates against involvement in the discipline. Community college faculty may teach as many as five classes each semester, which leaves virtually no time for direct involvement in the discipline through research, publication, performance, or any other appropriate professional activities. In addition, with the heavy teaching load it is very difficult for many faculty members to simply keep up in the discipline through reading journals, attending conferences, or taking workshops or graduate-level courses in the discipline.

The thesis of this paper is that community colleges can make some institutional changes which will result in the revitalization of mid-career faculty. Although each faculty member may have individual reasons for having evolved into "deadwood," the institution can make changes which will directly encourage the professional growth and renewal of mid-career faculty. Through these changes community colleges may be able to tap some of the initial energy and excitement that faculty members brought to the field when they were new. Alternatively, colleges may also encourage burned-out, disillusioned faculty members to find that new excitement by retraining for another field, or by embarking on a slightly different career path in the institution. In either case, I believe that it is possible for community colleges to revive the "deadwood," and to recapture the vitality which may be simply dormant.

This paper has been organized into three major sections. First the problem of faculty vitality will be examined: why it is a critical problem given the impending faculty shortage; symptoms of faculty burnout; measures of faculty vitality; and the specific nature of the problem of faculty vitality in the community college. Second, institutional causes of the problem will be analyzed, including the campus culture, workload, changes in the student population, and the tenure system and reward structure. Finally, solutions to the problem will be discussed by examining successful practices for revitalization

which have been used in business and in institutions of higher education. The conclusion will offer some specific applications for community colleges based on the literature by answering the following question: what can community colleges do to enhance the professional growth and vitality of mid-career faculty?

The Problem: A Lack of Vitality among Mid-Career Faculty

Recently college faculty have been receiving considerable criticism in the popular media. Charles Sykes' 1988 book, ProfScam, was an indictment of the American professoriate which provided fodder for newspaper editorials and lively discussions on radio talk shows. Among other "indictments" in his first chapter, Sykes notes that university professors ". . . are overpaid, grotesquely underworked, and the architects of academia's vast empires of waste"(p.5). Sykes continues, "They have twisted the ideals of academic freedom into a system in which they are accountable to no one . . ." (p.6). More recently, Page Smith's book, Killing the Spirit (1990) and Roger Kimball's book, Tenured Radicals (1990) have also been highly critical of the American professoriate.

In August, 1989 the Los Angeles Times published an editorial entitled "UC Tenure: a Forest of Deadwood," in which Jack Miles, a former professor, criticized the light workload and lack of research productivity of University of California professors. About a week later Joyce Appleby, a professor of history at UCLA, responded in a letter to the editor by enthusiastically agreeing with Miles' editorial. Appleby added, ". . . most of us accept the benefits of our situation. The fault lies with the university administration, which tolerates this use of taxpayers' money."

The issue of faculty vitality surfaced again in the L.A. Times in October, 1989, in an article titled "Plan for firing of inept UC Professors Stirs Debate" (Gordon). This article outlined the U.C. Berkeley Faculty Senate's proposal for firing tenured professors for reasons of incompetence, and noted arguments in opposition to this proposal. In January,

1990 another editorial appeared in the L.A. Times on the same subject, titled "Should Universities Remain Shelters for the Slothful?," which stated, "Tenure has long since deteriorated into a shield against the reality of the marketplace, a cover for incompetence and laziness . . ." (Yardley).

The point is, it is likely that the public is gaining a highly unfavorable opinion of college and university professors through the popular media. Colleges and universities may want to consider responding in kind, by pointing out the positive contributions of the majority of faculty. Although these articles are distasteful to many who are involved in higher education, it should be pointed out that they make some important points about faculty vitality: there are faculty members in higher education who do a minimum of work and are generally not accountable for their productivity and vitality once they are tenured. For this reason, colleges and universities should consider making some institutional changes which address the problem of dealing with the "slothful" or the "deadwood," to encourage the revitalization of the disengaged faculty.

Mid-career Faculty and the Impending Faculty Shortage

Why should colleges be concerned about revitalizing mid-career faculty? First, mid-career faculty are likely to be at the institution for a number of years. If they are disengaged, this would represent a terrible waste of potentially vital human resources. Second, institutions will be looking for many new faculty in the future as one large cohort of faculty retires over the next decade or more. If many mid-career faculty decide to retire early, or decide to leave higher education, colleges could be facing more severe faculty shortages than predicted. Moreover, mid-career faculty will provide some needed continuity for academic programs during this period of transition.

Mid-career faculty may be loosely defined as those who have achieved tenure, have been college faculty for perhaps between ten and thirty years, and who may be between the

ages of 40 and 55. According to a recent survey of the National Center for Education Statistics, the average age of full-time college faculty is 47, and one quarter of all college faculty are age 55 or older (Mooney, 1990, February). With a modal retirement age of 65 (Bowen & Schuster, p. 266), the mid-career faculty are likely to continue as faculty members for at least ten years or as many as twenty-five years. Of course, when the mandatory retirement age is lifted in 1994, faculty could choose to continue beyond age 70. In any case, this represents a significant amount of faculty time and human resources for an institution. According to a survey of community college faculty, older faculty showed less concern for students and spent less time interacting with students (Cohen & Brawer, 1987). If a substantial proportion of the mid-career faculty is no longer enthusiastic, the vitality of instutitions will suffer, and the quality of instruction is likely to decline.

The impending faculty shortage, an issue brought to prominence by Bowen and Schuster (1986), is likely to result in a greater dependence on the mid-career faculty. Because colleges and universities may be hard-pressed to find enough faculty, it will become critical to retain existing faculty members. George Keller comments on the aging of the faculty: "For any institution that wishes to increase its quality of instruction and research, the continuing rejuvenation of its faculty in the period ahead is supremely urgent" (1983, p.23).

It is possible that mid-career faculty who are disillusioned with academic life may choose to leave for positions in business or other non-academic settings. Mid-career faculty may feel "stuck" in their career due to a variety of situational or contextual reasons (Clark & Corcoran, 1987). Bowen and Schuster (1986) point out that mid-career faculty tend to move out of the academic setting when salaries in related non-academic settings are more attractive. However, if colleges are able to revitalize the

mid-career faculty by helping them to maintain their enthusiasm for their work as college professors, faculty members will be more satisfied and less likely to leave, and colleges will be able to meet their own future staffing needs.

Symptoms of Faculty Stress, Malaise, and Burnout.

How can institutions determine the extent of the problem of burnout among mid-career faculty? Caffarella, et al. (1989) point out that some faculty members will continue to be productive, according to traditional measures of productivity, even though they have lost enthusiasm for their work. Results of the 1984 survey of faculty done by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching indicated that about 40 percent of the faculty surveyed were "less enthusiastic about their work now than when they began their academic careers" (Schuster & Wheeler, 1990, p. 11). However, a more recent faculty survey shows that faculty morale may have improved somewhat: 34 percent were less enthusiastic about their work (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). In recent years, several studies and reports have documented low morale and a general malaise among mid-career faculty (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1983; Boyer, 1987; Eble & McKeachie, 1986).

Altshuler & Richter (1985) describe the true burnout victim as one who ". . . has an overwhelming sense of failure and loss of pride related to being in the wrong career at the wrong place for too long a time, with no prospects for change." Faculty greet each other with another horror story about unmotivated students or unreasonable administrators, often assuming that burnout is the norm. Cohen and Brawer provide the following description of faculty burnout: "Burnout suggested people whose fatigue was caused by environmental pressures beyond their control" (1989, p. 80). One example is the pressure to do too many diverse tasks in too little time: teaching, research and writing, and committee work (Seldin, 1987). Another example is a simple lack of enthusiasm for

facing another week of work. Jaffe and Scott describe the burned out as those who ". . . experience little satisfaction, feel uninvolved, detached, and uncommitted to their work and coworkers." In addition, they work "far below their potential" (1988, p. 16). It is likely that the pace and intensity of the workload of faculty contribute to the burnout and malaise which occur in mid-career faculty.

Interestingly, James F. Calhoun, professor of psychology at the University of Georgia, asserts that those most succeptible to stress are "the best": "The one who has the most to give is at greatest risk to give out" (1988). Professions which require intense involvement with others tend to breed stress and burnout due to the constant or repeated pressures of dealing with people. Calhoun ascertains, ". . . prolonged and unrelieved stress leads to burnout -- in one's personal life, in one's professional life, and in the life of an institution." Symptoms of burnout are typically high absenteeism, low morale, and high job turnover. Again, colleges facing faculty shortages may want to carefully consider the possibility that some of their potentially "best" faculty could be burned out, and may be likely to leave the institution due to the results of stress and burnout.

A more serious form of burnout, termed "Professorial Melancholia" by psychologist David F. Machell of Western Connecticut State University, is an emotional disorder, a "crisis of low self-esteem," which Machell believes is unique to the professoriate (Mooney, 1989, November 1). Unlike those in other professions, professors are more likely to be self-critical when they do not meet their own expectations of perfection. This can result in faculty who feel misunderstood, discouraged, resentful, and isolated. Ultimately, as mid-career faculty, they may become hypercritical and angry toward others. Machell recommends counseling for those suffering from "Professorial Melancholia," as well as developing relationships with positive people, and seeking diversions.

Measures of Faculty Vitality

In most four-year colleges, both research institutions and state colleges which are generally considered to be teaching institutions, faculty vitality is typically measured in terms of research productivity. Some faculty handbooks state clearly that in reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion it is important to consider that professors must have "something to profess" which is the result of their own research (Gonzalez, 1987). Usually research productivity is measured quantitatively: how many articles or books have been published? Sometimes weighting systems are used to compare types of books or articles. Citations are also counted as a quantifiable measure of perceived quality among peers (Braxton & Brayer, 1986). In all cases, publications are usually the prime consideration in determining faculty productivity and vitality.

Finkelstein (1984) found five characteristics that were typical of the "professorial publisher:" 1) holds the doctorate; 2) is strongly oriented toward research; 3) began publishing early, even before earning a doctorate, and received early recognition for scholarly contributions; 4) is in close contact with developments in his or her field through interactions with colleagues and keeping up with the literature; and 5) spends more time in research, less time in teaching, and is not overly committed to administrative chores (p. 98). In addition, intrinsic factors, such as high self-expectations and an orientation toward research, tended to predict publishing productivity more than extrinsic factors, such as institutional pressure to publish.

Faculty in highly selective liberal arts colleges, including Amherst, Swarthmore, and Oberlin, have long followed a "teacher-scholar" model. E. Peter Volpe notes,

> A professor in any discipline stays alive when he is engaged in creative work, however modest. He stays alive when he carries his enthusiasm for discovery into the classroom. The professor is academically dead when the spark of inquiry

> is extinguished within him. It is then that he betrays his student. (Bessis & Guskin, 1986).

William C. Nelson concurs, "Can a faculty member be a really good teacher unless he continues to take seriously his own learning -- his scholarly development? For a while, perhaps, but indefinately, no" (Bessis & Guskin, 1986).

However, for many faculty there is a conflict: the institutional demands for research productivity are not congruent with the faculty's preference for teaching. (Austin & Gamson, 1983). The National Center for Education Statistics 1988 faculty survey revealed that in four-year institutions, faculty typically spend 52 percent of their time in teaching-related activities, 20 percent doing research, and the remainder in administrative and other activities (p. 48). Moreover, in the 1989 faculty survey, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that 58 percent of faculty members in four-year institutions viewed themselves as teachers, not researchers (p. 43); 45 percent agreed that the pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching (p. 51); and 74 percent agreed that there should be better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of the faculty (p.52).

In his 1987 book, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, Ernest Boyer states,

> While not all professors are or should be publishing researchers, they, nonetheless, should be first-rate scholars. We understand this to mean staying abreast of the profession, knowing the literature in one's field, and skillfully communicating such information to students. . . . As scholars, they must continue to learn and be seriously and continuously engaged in the expanding intellectual world (p.131).

A new report by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is now urging colleges and universities to take a broader view in defining faculty scholarship which

includes professional activities other than traditional research (Mooney, 1990, April 11). Eugene Rice, co-author of the report, explains that this is a four-part model of faculty scholarship which includes advancement of knowledge, integration of knowledge, application of knowledge, and scholarship that supports teaching (Weimer, 1990). This new model of faculty scholarship is a shift away from the "teacher-scholar" model which, Rice asserts, ". . . poses impossible standards that very, very few of us can meet." Rice believes that this proposed model of faculty scholarship recognizes the different strengths of individual faculty members and disciplines. Paul Lacey, professor of English at Earlham College agrees with this new definition of faculty scholarship, and asserts that there is a good opportunity now to recruit and prepare a new generation of college faculty with a greater emphasis on scholarship which enhances teaching rather than scholarship which enhances a research career (1990).

Faculty Vitality in the Community Colleges

Generally, very little is known about faculty productivity and vitality in the community college. Recently, however, a profile of outstanding community college teachers was developed by the Alliance for Excellence in Teaching, an organization which promotes quality teaching at Illinois' state community colleges. The profile was based on a survey of 19 of the faculty members who were selected as top teacher of the year in their community college. The "typical" top teacher belongs to about four professional organizations, attends about three professional conferences each year, and has published six professional works (Wisniewski, 1989).

Community colleges have generally not used research and publication as a method of determining faculty vitality. Because of the strong teaching mission of the community college, it would be rare to find a community college faculty member who prefers doing original research over teaching. In contrast to faculty in four-year institutions,

community college faculty spend 71 percent of their time in activities related to teaching, 3 percent doing research, and the remainder in administrative and other activities (National Center for Education Statistics, 1988, p. 48). Seidman (1985), however, addresses the "false dichotomy" of teaching and research:

> . . . the consequences of separating research from teaching plague their teaching efforts, affect their aspirations and sense of themselves, undermine their intellectual energy and conflict with a major source of satisfaction and renewal that should be available to all teachers as part of their work (p.253).

Under the new definition of faculty scholarship provided by the Carnegie report, community colleges could measure faculty vitality by looking at faculty involvement in at least three of the four types of scholarship: integrating knowledge for effective presentation to students through the development of course materials, textbooks, and lectures; applying knowledge through part-time consulting and professional work in the field; and scholarship that supports teaching, including the development of teaching methods which are effective for specific disciplines or for specific student populations.

Institutional Factors which Contribute to Faculty Vitality Problems.

Faculty vitality is influenced through individual factors and institutional factors. Individual factors include life cycle and career development stages, and motivations for productivity which are dependent on highly individualized intrinsic rewards. DeVries' study of faculty analyzed the reasons for the amount of time spent on teaching, research, and administration. An individual faculty member's self-expectations were by far the best predictor of the amount of time spent on each type of activity, with organizational expectations a distant second (Finkelstein, 1984, p. 93).

Unfortunately, other than careful hiring practices to select individuals who are highly self-motivated, institutions have little control over intrinsic factors, particularly

in mid-career faculty. For this reason, this paper will focus on the institutional factors which may have an impact on faculty vitality: the influences of institutional culture, department climate, and colleagues; faculty workload; changes in the student population; the tenure system; and the reward structure.

Institutional Culture

The "culture" of an institution is determined by a set of commonly held beliefs and values which guide the practices of those within the institution. Although the values may differ from one institution to another, each college has a set of values and beliefs which form the foundation for the institutional culture (Martin, 1985). Martin notes that a cohesive culture is essential for a strong college. He states,

> Good colleges can be grouped into three generic categories: The research university culture construes the university as pathfinder and disseminator of new knowledge, the community college culture views the college as a center of educational services, and the comprehensive liberal arts college culture interprets the college as contributing to vital connections, including the connections among body, mind, and spirit (p.80).

According to research done by Clark, Boyer, and Corcoran, faculty vitality is "a contextual phenomenon that varies in different institutional settings" (Baldwin, 1990, p. 162). For instance, a faculty member who is considered to be "vital" in a research institution may not be considered "vital" in a community college. Generally, "birds of a feather flock together:" those who want to do research are more likely to be found in research universities with others who enjoy doing research. This is largely a function of the recruitment and selection process in which each type of institution selects those who are likely to "fit" with the institutional mission (Dill, 1986). A comparison of research productivity measured in the number of publications indicates clearly that those in leading research universities have published considerably more than those in four-year

colleges, who, in turn, have published more than faculty in two-year colleges (Brenneman & Youn, 1988; Finkelstein, 1984; Dill, 1986). The culture and mission of the different types of institutions and the emphasis, or lack of emphasis, on research is widely known. The expectations of the institution have an impact on the amount of research and publishing done by faculty in each type of institution.

In their recent study of college faculty, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989) found that in general faculty feel positively about their own institution. In fact, 65 percent of the community college faculty felt that their institution was a "very good place," whereas 41 percent of four-year college faculty felt the same way about their institutions (p. 95). Fifty-seven percent of two-year college faculty rated the quality of life at their institutions as "excellent" or "good." But again, four-year faculty were somewhat less satisfied: 47 percent gave "excellent" or "good" ratings for the quality of institutional life (p. 113). Community college faculty felt more positively about the "sense of community" at their institutions, with 45 percent giving "excellent" or "good" ratings, whereas only 32 percent of four-year faculty gave "excellent" or "good" ratings (p. 115). A study of the Humanities faculty at Virginia Commonwealth University agreed with this finding: older faculty members felt that the sense of community was missing in some institutions of higher education (Armour, et al., 1987, p. 6). Finally, the intellectual environment at the institution was rated generally higher by two-year faculty than by four-year faculty: 49 percent of two-year faculty gave "excellent" or "good" ratings, and 42 percent of four-year faculty gave the same ratings to their institutions (Carnegie, 1989, p. 114).

Overall, it would appear that two-year college faculty are less critical and more satisfied with the environment of their institutions than four-year college faculty. This is particularly interesting in light of the commonly-held belief that faculty in community

colleges may be less satisfied because they are in institutions which are generally considered to be at the bottom of the higher education hierarchy. Moreover, community college faculty are generally more satisfied with the intellectual environment of their institutions than faculty in four-year institutions, even though the community college environment typically does not encourage scholarly pursuits such as research and publication. These findings seem to indicate that the institutional environment in the community college encourages faculty vitality.

Department Climate

Fifty-eight percent of two-year faculty and fifty percent of four-year faculty rated their departments as "very important to me" in the recent Carnegie Foundation study of college faculty (1989, p. 118). This would seem to indicate that at least half of the faculty identify strongly with their departments and are, therefore, likely to be influenced positively or negatively with the climate of the department.

In a study titled, "What Characterizes a Productive Research Department" (1986), Leonard Baird concluded that the factors varied from one discipline to another. In the sciences, for instance, up-to-date laboratory facilities influenced the number of articles published. In other disciplines, apprenticeship programs made a positive impact on research productivity. For this reason, it is often recommended that faculty vitality be studied in the context of departments and disciplines (Baird, 1986; Clark, 1987). One generalization may apply across disciplines: departments which show a high level of research productivity have an atmosphere in which research is encouraged. In fact, young faculty coming into consistently productive departments become productive: their publication rates match the norms of the department (Baldwin, 1988).

The major difference between research universities and community colleges is the way in which faculty vitality is measured. In the community colleges, although

departments do not normally encourage the type of traditional research which is encouraged in research universities, the norms of the department are still likely to influence the behavior of others in the department. Faculty members who find themselves "surrounded by people who are creative and energetic" are likely to also exhibit these traits: vitality tends to breed vitality (Schuster, 1985). In departments which are very active faculty may typically develop new curriculum on a regular basis, attend professional meetings, and participate actively in developing or learning innovative teaching methods which will make the department courses more effective. In other departments in which the norms are not as active, faculty vitality might be discouraged rather than encouraged.

Influence of Colleagues

Peter Drucker (1973) notes that work is a social bond and a community bond: work provides companionship, group identification, and a social bond. Drucker points out that companies who poll their retired employees find these typical reactions: "What we miss isn't the work; it's our colleagues and friends. What we want to know isn't how the company is doing but what the people do with whom we worked, where they are, how they are coming along" (p. 187).

The social aspect of research in universities fits with Drucker's theories. Dill cites several studies of research productivity which have shown that research and other scholarly activities involve a social process. Dill states, "The amount of collegial exchange and social interaction among research colleagues appears to be related to individual research performance" (p.14). The benefits of social interaction among colleagues include having the opportunity to test new ideas and share discoveries as well as simply enjoying exchanges with others who share similar interests. Creswell (1985) maintains that "Productive researchers are those individuals who maintain regular

contacts with colleagues, especially research-oriented colleagues" (p.38). Creswell cites research which has shown that productive researchers tend to maintain regular contact with colleagues on a semi-weekly or daily basis.

In colleges and universities, the "group identification and social bond" is twofold, including both colleagues in the institution, and colleagues in the same discipline in other institutions or even outside academe in business. Finkelstein (1982) found that productive faculty were strongly involved with off-campus colleagues as well as colleagues in their own campus department. Interpersonal contact includes telephone conversations and personal visits with colleagues outside the institution, correspondence with major research facilities, and receipt of unpublished manuscripts from colleagues. Impersonal contact mainly involves being on the receiving end of new information through professional journals and attending conferences. Research cited by Creswell (1985) indicates that the interpersonal contacts are far more important in determining faculty productivity than the impersonal forms of professional contact (p. 39).

The recent Carnegie survey of faculty indicated that eighty-one percent of two-year college faculty and 77 percent of four-year college faculty felt that their academic disciplines were "very important" (p. 117). However, when asked "How important to you are national or internation societies in you discipline?," only 21 percent of four-year faculty and 13 percent of two-year faculty agreed that they were "very important" (p. 119).

In light of this, it is not surprising to find that many community college faculty feel out of touch with colleagues in their fields (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). Although community college faculty do not fit the research collaboration model presented by faculty in research universities, it is just as important that they remain vital in their own discipline by maintaining contact with others in the discipline,

both within their own institution and outside the institution. Although community college faculty attach a great deal of importance to their own discipline, it is possible that community college faculty do not maintain contact with others in the discipline simply because they do not attach importance to their own professional societies. In addition, because they are not collaborating on research projects with other faculty, they may not feel a pressing need to maintain regular contact with them.

Workload

Faculty in the community college face a major problem: finding sufficient time for any type of scholarly involvement. One faculty member states,

> At a teaching college you teach and you teach and you teach with no time for research, no time for contemplation, no time for participation in outside affairs. Just teach and teach and teach until your mind grows dull and your creativity vanishes and you become an automaton saying the same dull things over and over to endless waves of innocent students who cannot understand why you are so dull, lose respect and fan this respect out into the community (Gleazer, 1980, p. 167).

In contrast, most faculty in research universities teach less than nine hours per week, spend more time in research than in teaching, and show three to four times the research productivity of other types of institutions (Dill, 1986). "The task structure of faculty in research universities, therefore, discinctly supports research performance" (Dill, 1986). But does the task structure of faculty in community colleges allow for sufficient involvement in the discipline in order to support teaching performance?

Some believe that faculty are required to do too many different jobs which are unrelated. Several studies have reported that one of the greatest sources of stress is the excessive demand to perform many different tasks (Austin & Gamson, 1983, p. 76). In addition to stress, this may result in lower efficiency and a poorer quality of work.

However, at the other end of the scale, Armour (1987) notes that some faculty fall into the trap of monotony:

> Faculty members are perhaps in the only profession in which the most qualified people perform the same tasks they did when they entered the profession. In business, when a person moves up the corporate ladder, he or she assumes different responsibilities, but in academe the duties remain much the same (p. 5).

It is interesting that faculty who are considered to be "vital" by their colleagues tend to vary their tasks more than other faculty. Although the majority of their time is spent in teaching activities, "vital" faculty tend to spend more time in research and administrative activities, but less time in instruction-related activities than their colleagues. The "vital" faculty also tend to work longer hours than their colleagues (Baldwin, 1990, p. 167). In another study, the highest research performance resulted when faculty spent about 30 percent of their time in research activities and the remainder on teaching and administration. Interestingly, low research performance was associated with a time commitment of less than 10 percent or more than 80 percent (Dill, 1986). Perhaps faculty who are the most productive and vital maintain their vitality by participating in a variety of activities rather than spending virtually all of their time in instruction-related activities or in research-related activities. Community colleges might consider this question: do faculty have sufficient diversity in their tasks to keep them intellectually stimulated and vital?

Changes in the Student Population

The student population has shifted in higher education to include many more underprepared students. Faculty who were surveyed at the Virginia Commonwealth University believed that the mission of the institution had changed without their consent. The researchers note, ". . . the necessity for teaching the marginally prepared student is a

laudable goal, but not one many faculty members choose for themselves" (Armour, et al., 1987, p. 6). The 1989 Carnegie faculty survey indicated that although faculty showed more positive feelings about the profession than in 1984, many felt that the quality of the student population had declined (Mooney, 1989, November 8). Specifically, 70 percent of four-year faculty and 85 percent of two-year faculty agreed with the statement, "The undergraduates with whom I have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989, p. 19). Many faculty also see a generally low level of student motivation: 51percent of four-year faculty and 63 percent of two-year faculty agreed that "Most undergraduates at my institution only do enough to get by."

How does the change in the student population affect faculty vitality? According to Cohen and Brawer (1989), faculty vitality may be affected in two different ways. First, an underprepared, unmotivated student population is likely to lead to dissatisfaction with teaching, because it becomes more difficult for faculty to affect the achievement of their students. Most faculty originally chose to teach in college because of the intrinsic rewards of affecting student learning and growth. Second, a large population of underprepared students often results in a shift in college resources: more remedial and basic classes and fewer advanced, specialized classes. For this reason, faculty members who used to look forward to the opportunity of teaching a class in their speciality to the more capable, motivated advanced students now rarely have that opportunity.

Tenure System

The majority of American college faculty, 59 percent, do not believe that abolishing tenure would improve the quality of American higher education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989, p. 142). Chester E. Finn disagrees. Finn recommends abolishing the tenure system because he believes it adversely affects productivity.

> Once you get tenure there is essentially no obligation to do anything at all other than go through the motions of meeting your classes, which in many cases are not all that numerous. . . . nothing prohibits you from doing next to nothing (1987, p.27).

Although many have criticized tenure for the same reasons noted by Finn, there is very little hard evidence to indicate that faculty vitality is lower as a result of tenure. In a study of faculty at institutions using "term contracts" rather than tenure, no significant relationships were found between the absence of tenure and faculty performance or faculty morale (Chait and Ford, 1982, p. 50). Although Finn and others contend that abolishing tenure would increase faculty productivity, this study was not able to offer conclusive evidence of this. Perhaps the number of colleges which do not use tenure systems is so small that it may be difficult to make any accurate comparisons. Moreover, faculty who choose to work at colleges without tenure are likely to have somewhat different attitudes toward tenure, thus complicating the validity of any comparisons.

Another method which may be used to evaluate the effect of tenure on faculty vitality is to compare those in tenure-track positions who have not yet achieved tenure with those who are tenured. The recent faculty survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics showed that full-time faculty of all ranks, tenured and untenured, spent an identical number of hours working at the institution: an average of 48 hours per week (1990, p. 47). The same survey revealed that there were only minor differences in the amount of time spent in the three activities of teaching, research, and administration: full professors spent more time in research and administration and less time teaching than faculty in the other two ranks; associate professors spent more time in research and administration and less time in teaching than assistant professors; and assistant professors spent slightly more time teaching and slightly time in research and administrative activities compared to those in the higher ranks (p. 50). These results

appear to indicate that faculty behave in similar ways before and after tenure.

Moreover, Chait and Ford (1982) point out that tenure is too prevalent to be easily overthrown. They report that a tenure system is used by about 85 percent of all institutions which employ about 95 percent of all faculty (p. 10). According to the 1988 survey of college faculty by the National Center for Education Statistics, 60 percent of all full-time faculty were tenured and an additional 22 percent were in tenure-track positions (1990, p. 7). It would be hard to conceive of this large majority of faculty voluntarily giving up tenure to improve productivity. Moreover, it would probably be more difficult to attract new faculty to the profession if tenure were abolished entirely (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

The Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California addressed the issue of tenure in their 1989 report:

> Tenure is not . . . intended to be a shield for the later neglect of faculty duties or for incompetence. In order to protect the institution of tenure from abuse . . . each institution of higher education must insure a continuing process of post-tenure evaluation, compled with programs designed to insure continuing competency on the part of all faculty (p.91).

Reward Structure

In an article entitled "On the Folly of Rewarding A, While Hoping for B," Steve Kerr notes that many colleges have dysfunctional reward systems which may discourage rather than encourage desired behaviors (Mowday, 1982). In universities, research is rewarded, although good teaching is considered desirable. Faculty members generally want to spend their time in instruction-related activities, but they are encouraged, through the reward system, to neglect their teaching duties in order to spend more time on the more highly rewarded research activities.

The reward structure in community colleges is somewhat different. Tenure in community colleges is often almost automatic and is generally based on teaching evaluations, with little consideration for continued involvement in the discipline. Salary increases for community college faculty are often based on a lock-step progression on a salary schedule according to a combination of years of service and academic credentials. Although these salary schedules are structured to be fair to all faculty, they do not provide incentives for achievement and vitality. When a faculty member reaches the highest point on the salary schedule, salary increases are minimal and are often dependent on negotiated across-the-board increases in the salary schedule. For this reason, salary increases generally do not provide substantial rewards for mid-career faculty.

McKeachie (1982) notes that research has shown that when an individual receives an extrinsic reward, such as a salary increase, for doing something which is enjoyable for its own sake, the individual's motivation to continue that activitiy drops. McKeachie argues that salaries are not the reason that individuals choose to become college faculty members, instead they are driven by intrinsic motivations. Although he believes that salaries should not be heavily emphasized, he notes that low salaries are bad, particularly if they fall below expectations. Low salaries are likely to breed dissatisfaction and a deterioration of commitment to the job and to the institution.

Many college faculty gain tenure and reach the top ranks of the professoriate with twenty years or more left before retirement (Armour, et al., 1987). The lack of opportunities for promotion or advancement can result in a certain level of discontentment or feelings of "stuckness." Kanter notes that "moving" workers, those who continue to learn and advance professionally, are far more energetic in their work than those who feel professionally "stuck," who tend to have low morale and limited productivity (Baldwin, 1990). For this reason, institutions which offer rewards in the

form of opportunities for career growth and advancement, and opportunities for developmental activities which open new career paths within the institution are likely to see a greater amount of effort exerted by faculty, and a greater degree of work commitment (Baldwin, 1990; Clark, Corcoran, and Lewis, 1986; Toombs, 1985).

In a recent study (Baldwin, 1990), faculty who were considered to be "vital" by their colleagues were compared with a representative group of faculty in the same institution. Although they encountered identical environmental conditions, those who were identified as "vital" faculty tended to gain rewards by capitalizing more fully on the available opportunities and resources than their colleagues. For instance, almost half of the "vital" faculty had received some form of assistance from administrators, but only one fifth of the representative faculty had benefited in the same way. "Vital" faculty also received more research grants, received more support for professional development, and received more encouragement, recognition, and rewards. Sabbatical programs, teaching improvement grants, and summer seminars were also mentioned by "vital" faculty as stimulating their own professional growth. These results would seem to indicate that although it is a good idea to offer resources and rewards, those who are most likely to benefit are those who are already the more "vital" faculty.

What about those who are doing minimal work? A study conducted by the research firm of Yankelovich, Skelly and White found that about half of the people they interviewed said that they worked just hard enough to avoid getting fired, and 75 percent said that they could be "significantly more effective on the job." But more than half of this same group said that they have an inner need to do the very best job, regardless of pay. However, when they were asked why they did not work harder, two answers emerged: they did not get paid any more for working harder, and their managers did not provide incentives to work harder (Naisbett & Aburdene, 1985, p. 85).

The inner need to do a good job regardless of pay appears to be in conflict with the idea that good work should be rewarded with more pay or other incentives. How does this apply to promoting faculty vitality? First, it is widely recognized that college faculty tend to be motivated by the intrinsic rewards that come as a result of seeing growth and achievement in students, or by gaining recognition in the discipline. As mentioned earlier, McKeachie (1982) believes that faculty motivation will drop if financial rewards are given for an intrinsically rewarding activity. But according to the business study cited by Naisbett and Aburdene, these workers were also intrinsically motivated, yet they wanted some incentives and rewards for their good work. Perhaps colleges might also considering a reward system in which faculty are given incentives and even additional compensation for excellent work.

Solutions: How Institutions can Promote Faculty Vitality

Before considering solutions which promote faculty vitality, it might be useful to consider the attributes of "vital" faculty members in order to better understand the goals of an integrated institutional program to enhance faculty vitality. A good description of vital professors is provided by John W. Gardner from his 1963 book, Self-Renewal:

> Vital professors are curious and intellectually engaged. They enjoy the respect of their colleagues and are effective in the multiple roles of members of the academic profession. Perhaps most significant, vital professors grow personally and professionally throughout the academic career, continually pursuing expanded interests and acquiring new skills and knowledge. Adjectives that would apply to vital professors include: enthusastic, caring, dedicated, vigorous, creative, flexible, risk-taking, and regenerative (Baldwin, 1990, p. 180).

In his book entitled Peak Performers (1986), psycholgist Charles Garfield offers several insights into individuals who are "peak performers" in their field: "They are

always willing to evolve and grow, to learn from the work as well as to complete it, to be 'better than i ever was'" (p.16). Garfield continues,

> Peak performers are realists who believe: "In the final analysis, I will make it." They focus on achievement . . . "as an indicator that I am getting better, making progress toward being the best I can be." . . . [they] communicate a single theme: "I have done well, and I am capable of achieving much more. I am not finished yet. There is much more to me than this" (p.20).

Finally, Garfield notes that when asked, "Why are you so thoroughly involved in your work?," "peak performers" are likely to reply,"Because I love it!" (p.34).

Although Garfield studied high achievers from many different fields, his observations are similar to Gardner's description of vital professors: "peak performers" in any field are individuals who have a desire for personal and professional growth and development. In promoting faculty vitality, particularly among disengaged mid-career faculty, it is important for institutions to facilitate this growth by providing a variety of opportunities which will meet many different individual needs.

It is important to recognize that faculty must be self-motivated to regain or maintain their own vitality. But institutions may take positive steps to encourage the vitality of mid-career faculty. These strategies for promoting faculty vitality fall under six general headings: encouraging individualized professional growth, providing opportunities for greater job variety, offering faculty development workshops, evaluating post-tenure faculty, providing incentives and rewards for activities leading to faculty vitality, and creating a campus environment for vitality.

Individualized Professional Growth and Development

Each faculty member had very personal and individual reasons for choosing a career in his or her discipline: the initial interest and excitement about the discipline was

sparked by some event or some person. Likewise, each individual who is now disengaged and no longer excited about the discipline also had individual reasons for losing that initial enthusiasm. For these reasons, an individualized approach to faculty renewal may be very effective for mid-career faculty.

Individualized Growth Plans. An individualized professional growth plan is a self-designed written agreement which includes objectives, timelines, and action plans to meet the goals and needs of the individual. Because it is custom-designed by each faculty member, an individualized growth plan can meet the diverse needs of many different faculty while also serving institutional goals.

The first step in designing an individual growth plan is a planning conference between the faculty member and a campus coordinator of faculty career development (or the department chair) in which job responsibilities are reviewed and areas for growth are determined. The coordinator also assists the faculty member in developing goals and objectives for growth which meet individual needs and are congruent with the goals of the institution. The second step is to request the approval of the administration for the allocation any released time and other resources which are necessary to implement the growth plan. The third step is the implementation of the plan by the faculty member, and monitoring of progress toward goals by the coordinator. Finally, the fourth step is an mutual assessment of progress toward the growth goals upon completion of the contracted time between the faculty member and the coordinator. At this conference, a new growth contract may be established for the faculty member (Miller, 1989).

Individual growth plans might include the following activities: advanced course work; curriculum development; development of new course materials or alternative delivery methods; specialized training in new skills or state-of-the-art equipment; business or industry internships; faculty exchanges; instructional projects related to the discipline;

serving as a consultant; instructional improvement activities such as videotaping class sessions and peer observation and mentoring; and research projects; (Miller, 1989; Tucker, 1984).

Gordon College, a private Christian college near Boston, has been generally recognized as the first to use individualized growth plans. Their program started in 1976, and has been quite successful. Five years into the program, about two-thirds of the faculty were voluntarily developing professional growth plans. Ninety-two percent of the past program participants believed that they had done things as a result of their growth plans that they otherwise would not have done (Baldwin, et al., 1981). In addition to Gordon College, several other colleges have also developed programs of faculty renewal through individualized growth plans, including Moraine Valley College in Illinois, Columbia State Community College in Tennessee, Illinois Central College in East Peoria, and North Hennepin Community College in Minnesota (Miller, 1989).

Career Planning. In the recent book, Enhancing Faculty Careers (1990), Daniel W. Wheeler points out that career consulting for college faculty is a recent phenomenon. It is often assumed that college professors are "called" to their profession, and are, therefore, unlikely to change careers. However, this view does not take into account the changing conditions of the environment of academe mentioned earlier, nor does it address the "stuckness" felt by many mid-career faculty. For this reason, Wheeler recommends that colleges offer faculty a career consulting service which provides an opportunity for faculty to reassess their careers.

The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and the Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest developed a program entitled, "In Support of Career Planning and Development." The program included four components: first, an intensive three-day workshop in which faculty assess their current life situation and develop individual plans

for the next phase of their lives and careers; second, follow-up faculty workshops which address specific career development needs, such as retirement planning and job change strategies; third, workshops to assist administrators in supporting the growth and development of faculty; and fourth, faculty support groups and career change networks. Through these four components faculty were provided with the support necessary to re-evaluate their own careers, and to make changes in their career direction as needed (Baldwin, et al., 1981).

In a similar career renewal program in the Pennsylvania State College system, the faculty who participated in career development workshops continued their own renewal one year after the workshops. Some took sabbaticals or leaves, some changed careers, and others had developed new research interests. All participants agreed that the workshops were very worthwhile (Baldwin, et al., 1981).

A variety of career and life planning workshops for faculty and administrators have also been offered by a number of community colleges, including Prince George's Community College in Largo, Michigan, Lansing Community College in Michigan, the Maricopa Community College District in Phoenix, Arizona, and De Anza College in Cupertino, California. De Anza's program includes a three month career transition workshop which meets once each week for three hours, individual career counseling, and released time for faculty retraining in areas where the institution has a growing need (Baldwin, et al., 1981).

Career planning and consulting services have been used in the business world for many years. However, career aptitude testing is being used more frequently among mid-career professionals who are looking for new careers which may bring more personal satisfaction. Career consultant Helen Hewitt notes, "We're finding that people are not really happy, excited, passionately in love with what they're doing" (Mott, 1990).

Career aptitude testing could also be used to point out new options to mid-career faculty. Through career aptitude tests, faculty might discover new talents which might be used to revitalize their academic career and to benefit the institution.

Faculty Exchanges. Sometimes a change of environment in the form of a faculty exchange provides revitalization for faculty members. In a faculty exchange program, faculty members have the opportunity to teach in another institution for a semester or for a year. An exchange provides faculty members with the opportunity to experience different programs, curricula, and educational philosophies. Faculty who have been on an exchange typically return to their home campus with new energy and a change in perspective. In addition, the departments receiving new faculty members typically gain new insights into their own programs. The Community College Exchange Program (CCEP) is a national exchange program for community college faculty, administrators, and staff sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, The League for Innovation in the Community College, and Maricopa Community Colleges in Phoenix, Arizona. This program started in 1985 and was modeled after a similar program for faculty of four-year colleges, the National Faculty Exchange (Revitalization, 1990).

Faculty Internships. Internships are often considered to be only for students who are embarking on a career, or who want to try out a career before becoming fully committed. However, internships can serve several valuable purposes for mid-career faculty. First, for faculty in vocational and professional fields, an internship in business or industry provides an opportunity to update skills and to become reacquainted with new practices and procedures in the field. Second, for faculty who are considering a career change, an internship can provide a "try-out" period. Finally, for faculty who wish to ultimately move into an administrative position, an administrative internship can provide valuable insights into the scope of the job and necessary skills for administrative work.

Many colleges have offered professional growth opportunities through faculty internships. De Anza College started a faculty internship program in 1981. Faculty interns who teach primarily in vocational-technical fields work in non-academic settings for two to six months in order to stay up to date in their field (Baldwin, et al., 1981).

Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina took a somewhat different approach: they encouraged faculty in the humanities and social sciences to take summer internships in non-academic settings in order to "link a liberal arts faculty more effectively with the world their students would face following their college graduation" (p. 37). Although there was some reluctance to take part in this internship program, the faculty members who participated had very positive experiences. In fact, several of the faculty interns were offered permanent positions! One interesting positive outcome was that the participants discovered, to their surprise, that their skills were valuable in a non-academic setting. As a result, participants reported that this new awareness made them more self-confident in the classroom.

The seven-campus Dallas County Community College District offers opportunities for faculty to participate in an internal administrative internship program. Faculty participants design their internship experience with the administrative unit in which they will be working. Some faculty participate to acquire new skills, others want to see how they would like administrative work, and for others it is simply an opportunity for professional renewal (Baldwin, et al., 1981).

Sabbaticals. Probably the most common form of individualized professional development is the traditional semester-length or year-long sabbatical. Nearly three quarters of all institutions of higher education grant paid sabbatical leaves to faculty, and in over half of all institutions all ranks are eligible for sabbatical leaves (Zahorski, 1990, April). According to Ken Zahorski, Director of Faculty Development at St. Norbert

College in Wisconsin, one of the the biggest challenges for faculty is the development of a good sabbatical plan in order to take full advantage of the sabbatical experience. Zahorski has developed an extensive Sabbatical Handbook for the faculty of St. Norbert College, which includes the campus guidelines for sabbaticals, a sabbatical checklist and timetable, and guidelines for ensuring a successful sabbatical. In addition, comments are included from faculty who have been on sabbaticals. One faculty member advises, "Pick a project that actively challenges and engages you. Don't do what you think you 'should' do. Rather, do what you know will stretch you and excite you" (1990, p. 29). And another faculty member recommends, "Don't be afraid to admit you've fallen behind and want to become current in your own discipline. In other words, don't let your ego and pride keep you from learning and having a successful sabbatical" (p.55). Finally, another faculty member notes, "Breaking the pattern was central to my sabbatical. I could have dug ditches and it would have been as big a success as if I had written a book. Teaching requires a periodic break -- if it is to remain good, enjoyable teaching" (p. 49).

A Sabbatical leave is one of the "perks" of academe which is not generally not available in business. However, a recent book, Time Out by journalist Bonnie Miller Rubin (1987), makes the point that taking some time off from the job is just as important for people in business. She recommends that individuals who want a break from their work should negotiate a personal leave with their company, and make personal financial plans in order to finance their own leave.

Some individuals are fortunate enough to work for companies which offer their employees some form of sabbatical leave. Rubin found that quite a few companies have started to offer opportunities for unpaid personal leaves, and some, particularly the competitive high tech companies, even have formal paid sabbatical programs. Larry Chamberlin, spokesman for Rolm Corporation in Santa Clara, California notes that the

sabbatical leave is "one of our most popular benefits and one that helps us keep -- as well as attract -- quality people" (p. 27). Rolm offers employees three months of fully paid leave for every six years of service. Tandem Computer, Inc., offers a fully-paid six-week leave for every four years of service. IBM allows their employees social service leaves, at full pay, to volunteer at nonprofit community organizations. Wells Fargo offers paid "personal growth leaves." Company spokesman Nancy Thompson explains, "A personal growth leave should be something you love to do but can't accomplish because you're working" (p. 28). Wells Fargo employees have studied sculpture in Paris, the culture of the South Pacific at the University of Hawaii, and bonsai gardening in Japan. They have spent time weaving Indian rugs, composing piano concertos, and writing children's books. Finally, Time, Inc. offers all employees with ten years of service a six-month leave with fifty-percent pay for the purpose of "growth and discovery." Ann Fitzgerald, benefits manager for Time, Inc., explains the purpose of the sabbatical program:

> The reason we have the policy is that we want people to rejuvenate themselves. This is a very high-pressure business and long stretches without a break do nothing for the company and nothing for the employees. We want them to get out of the office and do their own thing, to return younger and healthier (p. 23).

For the most part, sabbatical leaves in academe are for the purpose of doing academic work in the field: updating knowledge, doing research, writing, taking advanced coursework, or retraining to teach in another field. Perhaps colleges might consider incorporating some of the elements of the sabbatical leaves offered by business for personal growth and rejuvenation. One faculty member at St. Norbert College recommends, "Keep everything in perspective and don't try to do too much" (Zahorski, 1990, p. 21). Another advises, "Attend to your soul as well as to your mind" (p.55). But psychologist Brian Gould points out, "A lot of people take time off when what they really

need is a job change. A sabbatical is not going to alter your feeling if you're returning to a situation you hate" (Rubin, 1987, p. 50).

Job Variety.

An academic career is quite different from a career in the corporate world. Most corporate executives think of their careers in terms of moving through a sequence of job positions which increase in responsibility and prestige. Although professors move through ranks and must work to achieve tenure, the duties remain basically the same throughout an academic career: a combination of teaching, scholarship, and institutional service. In fact, a study of the faculty at Virginia Commonwealth University revealed that faculty tend to focus their energy on one activity over the others throughout their careers (Fuhrmann, 1987). This can lead to stagnation or boredom in mid-career faculty.

Although a career in business probably offers more opportunities for career advancement and changes in job responsibilities, it is not uncommon for mid-career professionals to hit a "career plateau." They become frustrated if there is lack of opportunities for promotion, and they are likely to get bored with the monotony of performing the same duties. Hank Karp (1988), a career consultant, recommends that mid-career professionals reassess their current job by analyzing the tasks of the job to determine what might make the current job more rewarding or challenging. Then an action plan should be created to make changes in the current position which will make it more rewarding. Karp recommends negotiations with the manager to make modifications in the current position.

The same strategy may be applied to academic jobs. Piland and Frase (1989) recommend that faculty roles be restructured by using the "Job Characteristics Model" which was developed for use in business and industry. First, the core characteristics of the job are analyzed in three categories: variety and significance of tasks, autonomy, and

feedback. Then jobs are restructured for the individual to emphasize the more positive attributes of the job and to resolve any deficiencies in the job structure. The process of analysis and restructuring results in greater job satisfaction, higher intrinsic motivation for the job, and higher quality performance.

However, some faculty may want to make larger changes than job restructuring. Faculty who want new challenges may choose to make a temporary change in their responsibilities. In addition to sabbaticals, internships, and faculty exchanges, faculty might consider teaching an unusual class, helping other faculty to design new courses, team teaching assignments, or helping to design and teach interdisciplinary classes (Armour, et al., 1987; McKeachie, 1983; Lynton & Elman, 1987). Schuster (1985) recommends that department chairs strongly encourage faculty to teach a variety of courses so that they do not teach exactly the same courses every year.

Some faculty may want to make a more permanent change in job responsibilities, such as retraining to teach in a different field. Monroe Community College near Rochester, New York has used a program of retraining to ease overstaffing problems in areas in which student demand has decreased by retraining faculty for areas which are difficult to staff and areas in which there has been an increase in student demand. Financial support includes a tuition reimbursement program and released time for retraining. In addition to easing the staffing problems, the retraining program has resulted in a revitalization of the departments in which the retrained faculty started teaching (Petrovich & Hexter, 1986). The Northwest Area Foundation supported grants to institutions for retraining faculty to teach in different disciplines, and for preparing faculty to move into administrative responsibilities. Eugene Rice (1985) notes the advantages of faculty retraining programs:

Programs of this sort encourage professional renewal by enabling faculty to develop

new areas of expertise and skill, while also fostering more efficient utilization of an institution's resources by moving redundant faculty into areas of higher demand (p.17).

Baldwin (1990) recommends that colleges encourage and foster more diversified academic careers to provide faculty with continuing challenges and opportunities for growth. Although titles or ranks may remain the same Baldwin maintains that, "new or redefined assignments can maintain a sense of newness in one's professional life" (p.175). Colleges should not only encourage faculty who desire greater diversity in their duties, but should also provide opportunities for faculty to achieve their goals. By providing opportunities for new responsibilities, the institution benefits through revitalized faculty, and the faculty benefit by having new and interesting challenges.

Faculty Development.

Peter Drucker has said that in order for a worker to take responsibility for his job, three elements must be present: productive work, feedback information, and continuous learning (1973). Drucker asserts that continuous learning

> . . . satisfies the need of the employee to contribute what he himself has learned to the improvement of his own performance . . . . It is also one way to come to grips with two basic problems: the resistance of workers to innovation and the danger that workers will become "obsolete" (p.269).

Drucker believes that a program of continuous learning should be organized, and should provide the following challenges to the worker:

> What have you learned that can make your job and the job of all of us more productive, more performing, and more achieving? What do you need by way of knowledge, by way of tools, by way of information? And how do we best prepare ourselves for new needs, new methods, new performance capacities? (p. 270)

In the same respect, continuous learning is necessary if faculty are to grow professionally, improve their performance, and prepare for new needs. An on-going program of faculty development is important for the continuing renewal of all faculty, but it is particularly critical for the mid-career faculty who are likely to be at the institution for many years to come. The former director of the Association of American Colleges' (AAC) Faculty Development Project, William C. Nelson, recommends a program of integrated faculty development activities to serve the diverse needs and interests of the faculty. The AAC Faculty Development Project provided faculty development activities in four categories: "professional development," including scholarship, research skills, and broadening of scholarly areas; "instructional development," such as teaching improvement and developing new teaching techniques; "curricular change," including the development of new courses, making changes in current offerings, and the development of interdisciplinary courses; and "organizational development" which includes the development of reward systems to enhance faculty renewal, the development of new committee systems, and a focus on campus-wide goals (Nelson, 1983).

In the State University of New York at Cortland, the professional development of faculty members is encouraged through computer skills training (Calhoun, 1988). Mid-career faculty members who are not yet computer-literate may feel somewhat intimidated by computers and perhaps even sheepish about their lack of computer skills, particularly in light of the fact that the majority of their students have probably been using computers almost as long as they have been walking. However, in a non-threatening workshop atmosphere with other faculty members who are beginners on the computer, faculty members may learn to feel more comfortable with the computer. In addition to learning word processing skills, such as producing class handouts and exams, they are also likely to learn about computer applications that they had never before considered,

including research applications such as computer networks and databases, and applications for the classroom, such as in-class writing assignments in the computer lab, or even classroom demonstrations from a projected computer screen.

Quite often mid-career faculty are resistant to instructional development workshops because they have had many years of teaching experience. They may assume that teaching workshops are intended for new faculty or for faculty who need help to remedy poor teaching skills. But the majority of mid-career faculty received little preparation for classroom teaching, if any. A "Teaching Fellows Program" is an example of a faculty development program which provides for the instructional improvement needs of mid-career faculty. One mid-career faculty member who participated, somewhat reluctantly, in the University of Rhode Island's Teaching Fellows Program found it to be extremely beneficial. For the first time in his teaching career he started to think about his philosophy of teaching, about the goals and objectives for his classes, and about the effects of various teaching methods on student learning (Barker, 1983).

West Chester University of Pennsylvania has a week-long retreat each year which has two main purposes: to improve the quality of teaching, and to improve the quality of campus interpersonal relationships between faculty and students and among faculty. The name of the retreat is actually the philosophy of their faculty development program: "Flourish Faculty Rejuvenation" (Rejuvenating faculty and staff, 1989).

Several of the faculty development practices rated "effective" or "very effective" in Centra's 1976 study included various types of curricular reform, including the following practices: grants to faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching; visitation to other institutions to review educationnal programs or innovative projects; using faculty member curriculum development "specialists" to assist other faculty members in instructional or course development by consulting on course

objectives and course design (Toombs, 1985).

No matter which components constitute a faculty development program, it is very important for the faculty to be involved in the planning process (Tucker, 1984). Faculty will take ownership of a program of faculty development only if they are involved in the assessment of needs as well as the planning and implementation of such a program.

Post-tenure Evaluations.

In her book, Post-tenure faculty evaluation, Christine Licata recommends, "Post-tenure review should have a direct link to faculty development and should not operate in isolation from faculty development practices" (p.61). For this reason, the goals of the faculty developement program should be consistent with the criteria for faculty evaluation. For instance, if one of the evaluation criteria is "the use of various teaching methods which address different learning styles," faculty development workshops should be provided to equip faculty members with the skills they need in order to use various teaching methods.

One of the reasons for an on-going program of post-tenure evaluation is to support faculty development and improved instruction (Licata, 1986). Although each department generally has a rigorous set of criteria with which to evaluate faculty for tenure, after faculty have achieved tenure the evaluations of faculty performance may be somewhat cursory or even nonexistent. In community colleges, although periodic teaching evaluations usually continue after tenure, faculty rarely receive a thorough evaluation of their continued professional growth. Consequently, community college faculty have little or no external pressure for active involvement in the discipline. Those who choose to stay involved and maintain their skills and knowledge in the discipline do so because they are internally motivated.

Peter Drucker (1973) believes that it is important to build responsibility and

achievement into jobs by having each worker work with his or her manager to develop objectives for their own job. Performance evaluations may then be based on the objectives that had been set by the individual. In this way, the individual takes responsibility for his or her own achievement and buys into the evaluation process by determining their own evaluation criteria and job performance objectives.

This same principle can be applied in colleges, particularly for mid-career faculty. If each faculty member developed an individualized professional growth plan, as recommended earlier, they may also be evaluated against their own objectives in order to determine which objectives have been met and which areas of development may still need some work. Licata (1986) recommends self-evaluation as one of four components of a thorough post-tenure faculty evaluation. The other three components are input from administration, peers, and students.

Tucker (1984) includes an extensive list of criteria which might be used to evaluate teaching, research and scholarly activity, and institutional service, and a point system which might be used as a quantitative measure of faculty performance. Although measurable standards for faculty evaluation are recommended by Licata, she also recommends a flexible and individualized evaluation plan in which the criteria for evaluation are not standardized. In this way, the diversity of faculty interests and career stages are recognized and appreciated.

One of the problems in the community colleges has been the evaluation of scholarly activity. For the most part, scholarly activity has not been evaluated seriously because of the widespread feeling that community college faculty are full-time teachers, not researchers. Faculty typically have heavy teaching loads and are not really expected to do any type of research. However, some have argued effectively that there is a false dichotomy between teaching and research, and that they are actually complementary

rather than mutually exclusive activities (Seidman, 1985). Through his interviews of community college faculty, Seidman found that by separating teaching from research, community colleges have unintentionally caused problems for the faculty. Specifically, faculty felt that an emphasis on teaching to the exclusion of research "plagues their teaching efforts, effects their aspirations and sense of themselves, underminds their intellectual energy, and conflicts with a major source of satisfaction and renewal that should be available to all teachers as part of their work" (p. 253).

Because community college faculty have been considered as strictly teachers, they typically have very heavy teaching loads with little time for any type of scholarly activity. One social science teacher remarked,

> Teaching requires constant contact with information. It requires you to constantly go back to the well. You have to see what's going on. If you cannot do the research yourself, you have got to have access to the research. There are times it's very discouraging, because you know what has to be done. You know intellectually that you cannot do what needs to be done if you have five classes. It isn't because I am inept. It's simply because the conditions mediate against it (Seidman, 1985, p. 253).

The ideal solution would be for community colleges to cut back on teaching loads across the board. However, in most community colleges this is not financially feasible. An alternative might be to award released time to faculty on a rotating basis so that they would have the opportunity to become involved in scholarly activities periodically. If opportunities were provided for faculty to have sufficient time to become involved in some type of scholarly activity, faculty might be evaluated on their scholarly endeavors. But without sufficient time built into the job, it would be difficult to require community college faculty to take time away from their teaching for scholarly activities.

Attitudes toward the evaluation of scholarly activity in universities are starting to

change in order to accomodate a variety of research interests and to encourage more attention to undergraduate teaching. In fact, some of the new definitions of scholarly activity might be quite appropriate for community colleges. Eugene Rice, co-author of the 1990 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching report, The New American Scholar, believes that reward structures must be changed so that faculty and administrators recognize the legitimacy of other forms of scholarship (Weimer, 1990). In addition to traditional research and publication, the report recommends evaluating and rewarding the process of gaining knowledge through a wide variety of professional activities (Mooney, 1990, April 11). These activities might include keeping up with the literature of the field, attending conferences, gathering and synthesizing new course materials, developing new teaching methods, writing textbooks, consulting, and working in the field, and collaborating on projects.

Incentives and Rewards.

Incentives and rewards are forms of external motivation which may be effective in revitalizing some disengaged mid-career faculty. In fact, it might require incentives and rewards to motivate mid-career faculty to become involved in new teaching and research activities which will enhance their vitality.

Although both incentives and rewards are forms of external motivation, there is a subtle difference between the two. Incentives are offered before participation in an activity as a condition of participation or as an enticement to participate. Rewards are given after the completion of an activity as a result of having performed successfully.

Incentives. Ernest Boyer (1987) recommends that colleges routinely set aside funds which might be made available to faculty members as grants for the development of new teaching methods or for research or other scholarly activities. Baldwin and Krotseng (1985) point out that mid-career faculty who receive even a small research grant are

often "brought back to life" professionally. The grant provides much more than monetary support: it indicates that the institution believes in the capabilities of the faculty member. For faculty with heavy teaching loads and limited time, released time and paid leaves are incentives which might be used to motivate faculty to continue their learning or to work on special projects (Wood, 1988; Bowen, 1985). Department chairs, the academic dean, and the director of faculty development should take on the responsibility of working to establish effective faculty incentive programs. Some campuses may need to establish new policies, and some deans may need to manipulate the existing institutional structure and operating systems to provide faculty incentives, but the result is likely to be better faculty morale, and more productive faculty (Bevan, 1985).

Rewards. Expectancy theory is discussed by Mowday (1982) as one method for motivating faculty. Faculty make decisions to participate in certain activities or to exhibit certain behaviors because they know that these activities or behaviors are likely to be rewarded. For instance, in research universities, research productivity is rewarded through promotions and tenure. In community colleges the same principle is true, although usually teaching-related activities are rewarded. However, at Kalamazoo Valley Community College in Michigan, faculty are rewarded for their publications. Faculty receive credit toward advancement on the salary schedule for each publication in the same way that they would receive credit for completing graduate-level coursework (Kroll, 1989). This points out that community colleges might encourage those who enjoy research and writing by building rewards into the salary structure.

It is often recommended that colleges set aside funding for extrinsic rewards for faculty excellence. Bevan (1985) recommends that colleges reward their faculty for their talents: faculty who excel in research should be rewarded with additional research time; faculty who are excellent teachers should be rewarded with released time for teaching

preparation; those who author books, exhibit artwork, perform, or lecture should be rewarded with released time to pursue these activities further.

Deegan and Tillery (1985) agree that excellent performance should be rewarded, but advocate a slightly different reward structure. For instance, excellent faculty could be provided with opportunities to expand or diversify their teaching roles. Excellent faculty with a desire for leadership experience may be recognized with quasi-managerial leadership positions such as project director, researcher, coordinator, team leader, or planner.

Because it is in a fairly remote location, Plymouth State College in New Hampshire rewards their excellent faculty by sending them to conferences. One of the highest honors for faculty at Plymouth State is to be selected as a member of the faculty team that goes to the annual AAHE conference. This reward provides provides recognition for excellence, an opportunity for renewal, and a learning experience in which faculty gain appreciation for the scope of higher education beyond their discipline (Kalikow, et al., 1990).

Merit pay is an example of an extrinsic reward which may increase faculty productivity (Wood, 1988). Although merit pay rewards productivity, it also penalizes those who are deemed to be unproductive. Some faculty members and faculty unions have argued that merit pay rewards those who are "friends" of the administration, and may penalize those who are outspoken or controversial (Chait & Ford, 1982). For this reason, clear criteria for merit pay should be established and adhered to.

Gmelch (1987) notes that although monetary rewards have traditionally been linked with recognition of excellence, other forms of recognition can also be effective rewards. Excellent teaching, research, and service may be recognized through annual awards on a departmental level as well as at the institutional level. News releases on faculty activities as well as other forms of publicity in the local media also recognize and encourage faculty

achievements. Recognition for excellent work takes relatively little time and trouble, but is very important in demonstrating an appreciation for excellent work, and results in promoting the self-esteem of the faculty (Schuster, 1985).

Institutional Environment.

The influence of the environment, or the "culture," of the institution cannot be underestimated. Faculty vitality can spread like wildfire if the flames are fanned with a vital institutional environment. Noted management expert, Robert Waterman, believes that the leadership must create the environment for vitality and renewal (1987). Tom Peters (1985) says that although people must motivate themselves, ". . .they should work in an atmosphere that fosters self-motivation . . . self assessment . . . and self confidence" (p. 206). Although there is no specific set of factors which explain the differences in faculty performance, Baldwin and Krotseng (1985) agree that "the academic workplace provides a context (an organizational culture) that influences both the objectives and performance of faculty members."

How can a less than vital atmosphere be turned around? First, in addition to competent leadership and a strong commitment of organizational members, it takes a substantial period of time to create a new culture (Perlman, et al., 1988). But it is important to remember that faculty are not likely to respond well to changes that are forced upon them. To change the institutional environment it is crucial to build in incentives and opportunities for faculty renewal. In this way, change can be stimulating rather than threatening, and change can be rewarded (Gleazer, 1980).

Other steps may be taken to create a more vital institutional environment. Blackburn and Baldwin recommend a thorough analysis of the structural components of the campus environment, including formal and informal components, to identify the environmental conditions that affect faculty vitality (1983). For instance, if the institution believes that

research productivity is important, the campus environment might need to be changed to encourage more research. Eastern Michigan University was able to create an environment of research productivity through a well-organized program of research collaboration among groups of faculty. These collaborations resulted in over 80 published articles and many presentations at conferences in four years (Goetter, 1990).

A congenial, caring atmosphere is also important to faculty vitality. Ann Lucas (1989) recommends that department chairs create a positive department environment by demonstrating human caring, especially to the most alienated faculty members, through warm greetings, asking for an opinion or advice, or occasionally inviting faculty members to lunch. Human caring can also be demonstrated at the institutional level through policies which demonstrate a commitment to the psychological well-being of the individual. For instance, Miami-Dade Community College provides faculty with a full-year of pay, but a rolling summer school schedule in which each faculty member teaches summer school only every third summer. In addition, faculty promotions at Miami-Dade provide recognition and salary increases.

Finally, the AACJC report, Building Communities, recommends that every community college show its commitment to faculty vitality and renewal through the development of a comprehensive Faculty Renewal Plan in consultation with the faculty. The development and implementation of such a plan will demonstrate clearly to faculty that the institution has a strong commitment to faculty vitality. Through this commitment, the institutional environment can be changed to one of vitality.

Conclusions: Implications for Community Colleges

Many community colleges are not willing to face up to the problem of mid-career faculty who are out of date. By ignoring the problem, valuable human resources are being wasted and educational quality is being adversely affected. Community colleges have a dual

mission: to provide a high-quality lower-division education for students who play to transfer to a four-year university, and to provide high-quality vocational programs for students who are preparing for careers which do not require a four-year college degree. Neither of these missions may be accomplished if faculty members are out of date. Students who transfer to a university may find that they are behind, and students who complete vocational programs may find that their skills are insufficient to gain employment.

It is possible that some faculty members do not even realize that over the years they have slowly become out of touch with their discipline. Others may be burned out or disengaged and frustrated that they are no longer as excited about their discipline or about teaching as they were when they first started teaching in the community college. Although the motivation for faculty vitality rests ultimately with the individual, community colleges can provide an environment which encourages faculty vitality through the following methods:

- Encouraging faculty to reassess their own individual growth and career direction, and providing the means for faculty to enhance their own professional development.
- Giving faculty opportunities to increase the diversity of their tasks.
- Providing faculty development opportunities including on-campus workshops and travel funding for off-campus conferences and workshops.
- Evaluating faculty with regularly to provide feedback on performance and growth.
- Offering incentives and rewards for excellence in discipline-related activities, teaching, and campus administrative service.
- Creating an invigorating institutional culture in which vitality is the norm through a campus "Faculty Renewal Plan" developed in consultation with the faculty.

The Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) presents

an effective argument for colleges to encourage faculty vitality:

> The staff of a college is its single greatest resource. In economic terms, the staff is the college's most significant and largest capital investment. In these terms alone, we affirm that it is only good sense that the investment should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect (p.12).

Community colleges must be proactive in encouraging the vitality of mid-career faculty. In a period of impending faculty shortages and massive faculty turnover, this is a human resources development issue which must be seriously considered by community colleges. Through careful planning and allocation of resources for faculty vitality, community colleges will be able to maintain their commitment to a high quality education.

References

Altshuler, T. C., & Richter, S. L. (1985). Maintaining faculty vitality. In Puyear, D. E., & Vaughan, G. B. (Eds.), Maintaining institutional integrity (pp. 49-61). New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 52. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Appleby, J. (1989, August 21). Tenure and 'deadwood' at UC [Letter to the editor]. Los Angeles Times, Part 2, p. 10.

Armour, R. A., Caffarella, R. S., Fuhrmann, B. S., Wergin, J. F. (1987). Academic burnout: Faculty responsibility and institutional climate. In Seldin, P. (Ed.), Coping with faculty stress (pp. 3-11). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Austin, A. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, no. 10.

Baird, L. L. (1986). What characterizes a productive research department? Research in Higher Education, 25(3), 211-225.

Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the research university. The Journal of Higher Education, 61(1), 160-180.

Baldwin, R. G. (1988, November) Faculty vitality in "Different Worlds": The view from three academic areas. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, Missouri.

Baldwin, R. G., & Krotseng, M. V. (1985). Incentives in the academy: Issues and options. In Baldwin, R. G. (Ed.), Incentives for faculty vitality (pp. 5-19). New Directions for Higher Education, no. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1983). The condition of the professoriate: The variables and the data bases. In Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (Eds.), College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint (pp. 15-27). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Baldwin, R. G., Brakeman, L., Edgerton, R., Hagberg, J., & Maher, T. (1981). Expanding faculty options. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Barker, W. L. (1983). Ripples on the pond: A teaching fellows program examined. In Lacey, P. A. (Ed.), Revitalizing teaching through faculty development (pp. 71-79). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Bassis, M. S., & Guskin, A. E. (1986, July/August). Building quality: Research and the regional institutions. Change, pp. 57-60,66.

Bevan, J. M. (1985). Who has the role of building in incentives? In Baldwin, R. G. (Ed.), Incentives for faculty vitality (pp. 45-57). New Directions for Higher Education, no. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Blackburn, R. T. & Baldwin, R. G. (1983). Faculty as human resources: Reality and potential. In Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (Eds.), College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint (pp.5-14). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, Z. (1985). Faculty incentives: Some practical keys and practical examples. In Baldwin, R. G. (Ed.), Incentives for faculty vitality (pp. 33-43). New Directions for Higher Education, no. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1986). Assessing faculty scholarly performance. In Creswell, J. W. (Ed.), Measuring Faculty Research Performance (pp. 25-42). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Breneman, D. W., & Youn, T. I. (1988). Academic labor markets and careers. New York: The Falmer Press.

Caffarella, R. S., Armour, R. A., Fuhrmann, B. S., & Wergin, J. F. (1989). Mid-career faculty: Refocusing the perspective. The Review of Higher Education, 12(4), 403-410.

Calhoun, J. F. (1988, Fall). Academic rustout/burnout/renewal: A profession at risk. The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development, 6(3), 117-124.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). The condition of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends, 1989. Princeton, New Jersey: author.

Chait, R. P., & Ford, A. T. (1982). Beyond traditional tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Clark, S.M. (1987). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. E. (1987, Winter). The professoriate: A demographic profile. National Forum, pp.28-32.

Clark, S. M., Corcoran, M. E., & Lewis, D. R. (1986). The case for an institutional perspective on faculty development. Journal of Higher Education, 57 (2), 176-195.

Cohen, A. M. , & Brawer, F. B. (1989). The American community college, second edition. San Francisco: Jossye-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1987). The collegiate function of community colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988). Building communities. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Creswell, J. W. (1985). Faculty research performance. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 4. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Deegan, W. L., & Tillery, D. (1985). Renewing the American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Dill, D. D. (1986). Research as a scholarly activity: Context and culture. In Creswell, J. W. (Ed.), Measuring Faculty Research Performance (pp.7-23). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Drucker, P. F. (1973). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1986). Improving undergraduate education through faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). The American academic profession. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1982, March). Faculty colleagueship patterns and research productivity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Finn, C. E. (1987, Winter). Assessing the professoriate. National Forum, pp.26-27.

Fuhrmann, B. (1987, Winter). Career paths in higher education: Lessons from the corporate world. National Forum, pp.22-24.

Garfield, C. (1986). Peak performers. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Gleazer, E. J. (1980). The community college: Values, vision & vitality. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Gmelch, W. H. (1987). What colleges and universities can do about faculty stressors. In Seldin, P. (Ed.), Coping with faculty stress (pp. 23-31). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Goetter, W. G. (1990). Collaboration: A generative for faculty development through research and writing. Presentation at the Seventh Annual Conference of Kansas State University's Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, Orlando, Florida.

Gonzalez, N. L. (1987, Winter). The professor as researcher. National Forum, pp.7-10.

Gordon, L. (1989, October 24). Plan for firing of inept UC professors stirs debate. Los Angeles Times, pp. A1, A11.

Jaffe, D. T., & Scott, C. D. (1988). Take this job and love it. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.

Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (1989). California faces . . . California's future. Sacramento, California: author.

Kalikow, T. J., Weissman, S. M., Berry, V. M., & Bartelo, D. (1990, April 3). Incentives and support for "mid-course" faculty at Plymouth State College. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco.

Karp, H. (1988). How to handle the career plateau. Anherst, Massachusetts: ODT Associates.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kimball, R. (1990). Tenured radicals. New York: Harper & Row.

Kroll, K. (1989). Community college staff development: Institutional incentive for professional publication. Innovation Abstracts, 11(4). (The National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development, The University of Texas at Austin.)

Lacey, P. A. (1990, April 18). Let's not perpetuate our mistakes of the past as we prepare a new professorial generation. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. B1, B3.

Licata, C. M. (1986). Post-tenure faculty evaluation: Threat or opportunity? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 1.

Lucas, A. F. (1989). Motivating faculty to improve the quality of teaching. In Lucas, A. F. (Ed.), The department chairperson's role in enhancing college teaching (pp. 5-15). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Lynton, E. A., & Elman, S. E. (1987). New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Martin, W. B. (1985). Corporate culture -- College culture. In Fecher, R. J. (Ed.), Applying Corporate Management Strategies (pp.75-81). New Directions for Higher Education, no. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

McKeachie, W. J. (1983). Faculty as a renewable resource. In Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (Eds.), College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint (pp.57-66). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

McKeachie, W. J. (1982). The rewards of teaching. In Bess, J. L. (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 7-13). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 10. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Miles, J. (1989, August 13). UC tenure: A forest of deadwood. Los Angeles Times, Opinion section.

Miller, B. K. (1989, Spring). Individualizing faculty renewal. The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, 7(1), 33-37.

Mooney, C. (1990, April 11). Higher education conferees applaud Carnegie plan to broaden the definition of faculty scholarship. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1, A16.

Mooney, C. (1990, February 7). New U.S. survey assembles a statistical portrait of the American professoriate. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A15-18.

Mooney, C. (1989, November 8). Professors are upbeat about profession but uneasy about students, standards. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1, A18-21.

Mooney, C. (1989, November 1). Feeling Disillusioned? Unappreciated? You may be a victim of what a psycholgist describes as 'professorial melancholia.' The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A13-14.

Mott, P. (1990, February 26). I gotta be me. Los Angeles Times, pp. E1-2.

Mowday, R. T. (1982). Expectancy theory approaches to faculty motivation. In Bess, J. L. (Ed.), Motivating professors to teach effectively (pp. 59-70). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 10. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1985). Re-inventing the corporation. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

National Center for Education Statistics (1990). Faculty in higher education institutions, 1988. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Nelson, W. C. (1983). Faculty who stay: Renewing our most important resource. In Baldwin, R. G., & Bleckburn, R. T. (Eds.), College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint (pp.67-83). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Perlman, B., Gueths, J., & Weber, D. A. (1988). The academic intrapreneur. New York: Praeger.

Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence. New York: Random House.

Petrovich, J., & Hexter, H. (1986). Campus approaches to faculty retraining. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Piland, W. E., & Frase, L. (1989, Fall). Restructuring the faculty role: A research-based approach. The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development, 7(3), 107-113.

Rejuvenating faculty and staff. (1989, March 13). Administrator, the management newsletter for higher education, pp. 1-2.

Revitalization through exchange (1990). Phoenix, Arizona: The Community College Exchange Program.

Rice, R. E. (1985). Faculty lives: Vitality and change. St. Paul, Minnesota: Northwest Area Foundation.

Rubin, B. M. (1987). Time out. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Schuster, J. H., & Wheeler, D. W. (1990). Enhancing faculty careers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Schuster, J. H. (1985). Faculty vitality: Observations from the field. In Baldwin, R. G. (Ed.), Incentives for faculty vitality (pp.21-32). New Directions for Higher Education, no. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Seidman, E. (1985). In the words of the faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Seldin, P. (1987). Research findings on causes of academic stress. In Seldin, P. (Ed.), Coping with faculty stress (pp. 13-21). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Smith, P. (1990). Killing the spirit. New York: Viking.

Sykes, C. J. (1988). ProfScam: Professors and the demise of higher education. Washington, D. C.: Regnery Gateway.

Toombs, W. (1985). Faculty vitality: The professional context. In Baldwin, R. G. (Ed.), Incentives for faculty vitality (pp.69-82). New Directions for Higher Education, no. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Tucker, A. (1984). Chairing the academic department. New York: American Council on Education.

Waterman, R. H. (1987). The renewal factor. New York: Bantam Books.

Weimer, M. (1990, April). Rethinking what it means to be a scholar. The Teaching Professor, 4(4), 1.

Wisniewski, R. (1989, December 5). Top professors: Tough and committed. The Community, Technical, and Junior College Times, pp. 1,4.

Wood, C. (1988, Summer). Maintaining and promoting faculty vitality. The Journal of Staff, Program & Organizational Development, 6(2), 81-86.

Yardley, J. (1990, January 11). Should universities remain shelters for the slothful? Los Angeles Times, p. B11.

Zahorski, K. J. (1990). The St. Norbert College sabbatical handbook. De Pere, Wisconsin: Office of Faculty Development, St. Norbert College.

Zahorski, K. J. (1990, April 1). Reaping the full harvest: Some strategies for strengthening sabbatical programs. Workshop at AAHE National Conference, San Francisco, California.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges

MAY 31 1990